



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,833	09/25/2006	Nasser Rafiee	PA1906	3870
28390 7590 08/25/2010 MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC. IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT 3576 UNOCAL PLACE SANTA ROSA, CA 95403				
EXAMINER PREBILIC, PAUL B				
ART UNIT 3774		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 08/25/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.vasciplegal@medtronic.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,833

Applicant(s)

RAFIEE ET AL.

Examiner

Paul B. Prebilib

Art Unit

3774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the communication filed June 18, 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on June 18, 2010 is acknowledged.

Claims 22-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on June 19, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The alternative language of the claim is not clear because it appears to contain both Markush language and traditional alternative language in a way that makes the scope unclear; see MPEP 2173.05(h) that is incorporated herein by reference. The Examiner suggests amending claim language so that it clearly follows one or the other format for alternative language as explained in MPEP 2173.05(h).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated

by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 2 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,473,274. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. When the sleeve of the patented claims is considered equivalent to the catheter of the present claim, the scopes of the claims are overlapping to the extent that they are considered clear obvious in view of over each.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuslich et al (US 5,059,193). Kuslich et al anticipates the claim language where the tubular member as claimed is the body (12) of Kuslich et al (see Figures 2A, 3, 4, and 20), the locking member as claimed is the expander (14) and/or end cap (18), the compression device as claimed is rib(s) (18), and the compression device is transformable by axial force (see column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 39).

Regarding claim 15, the Applicant is directed to column 5, lines 12-14.

Regarding claim 16, the end caps of Kuslich are not axially compressible.

Regarding claim 20, the rib(s) of Kuslich et al self-expand upon application of the axial force.

Claims 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bonutti et al (US 5,454,365). Bonutti anticipates the claim language where the tubular member as claimed is portion (18) or sleeve (14) of Bonutti (see Figure 2), the locking mechanism as claimed is explained on column 9, lines 1-22 and shown in Figure 22 of Bonutti, and the compression device as claimed is arm(s) (160) of Bonutti.

Regarding claim 15, the Applicant is directed to column 12, lines 31-64.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cunci et al (US 5,752,969). Cunci et al anticipated the claim language where the delivery catheter as claimed is outer tube element (22) of Cunci et al (see Figures 8 to 10), the treatment device as claimed is blade(s) (26), the release mechanism as claimed is the combination of knob (8) and opening (24), and the push tube as claimed is inner tubular element (23).

Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barbut et al (US 6,086,605). Barbut et al anticipates the claim language where the delivery catheter as claimed is cannula (5) of Barbut et al (see Figure 1 and column 9), the treatment device as claimed is the filter device (10), the release mechanism as claimed is adjustment device (70) or knob (306), and the push tube as claimed is the tube (20).

Regarding claim 2, the tubular member as claimed is the tube (50) of Barbut et al, the locking mechanism as claimed is the ratchet slot (82) with switch (72), and the compression member as claimed is the filter (30).

Regarding claim 5, the first segment as claimed is plate (60) of Barbut et al, and the second segment as claimed is the port (3) containing tube portion.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Paul B. Prebilio whose telephone number is (571) 272-4758. He can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Isabella can be reached on 571-272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Paul Prebilio/
Paul Prebilio
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3774